UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/636,102 | 08/10/2000 | Daniel O. Ramos | 60259 | 6353 |

23735          7590          06/11/2004

DIGIMARC CORPORATION
19801 SW 72ND AVENUE
SUITE 250
TUALATIN, OR 97062

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| VU, THANH T |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2174 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| *Advisory Action* | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 09/636,102 | RAMOS ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Thanh T. Vu | 2174 |

*--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

THE REPLY FILED 21 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>21 April 2004</u>. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: <u>2,5-7 and 9-20</u>.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

*Kristine Kincaid*

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Applicant's primary argument regarding claims 2, 10, 12, 15, 20 is that Houser does not teach the object identifier is decoded from a water mark embedded in the selected media object file. The examiner does not agree because Houser teaches the object identifier is decoded from a water mark embedded in the selected media object file ( col. 4, lines 3-10; col. 15, lines 62-67; The examiner considers a watermark as a security object being embedded in an electronic document see col. 7, lines 30-43).

Applicant's argument regarding claim 5 is that Houser does not teach the file browser extension forwards the object identifier to a metadata server, and displays metadata or an action returned from the server. The examiner does not agree because Houser teaches the file browser extension forwards the object identifier to a metadata server, and displays metadata or an action returned from the server (fig. 1; col. 9,lines 55-60; col. 8,.lines 58-65; col. 12, lines 55-67).

Applicant's argument regarding claim 7, is that Houser does not teach the metadata or action is displayed as a URL link to information or a program associated with the selected media object file. The examiner does not agree because Houser's reference reads on the claim language of the metadata or action is displayed as a program associated with the selected media object file (col. 16, lines 34-51; col. 17, lines 33-48)

Applicant's argument regarding claim 11 is that Houser does not teach inserting a handler into the document when an object identifier is extracted from the media object wherein the handler is operable to display metadata linked via the object identifier in response to user input. The examiner does not agree because Houser teaches inserting a handler into the document when an object identifier is extracted from the media object wherein the handler is operable to display metadata linked via the object identifier in response to user input (col. 7, lines 30-43; col. 19, lines 17-26; col. 4, lines 3-10;col. 13, lines 35-50; col. 15, lines 62-67).

Applicant's argument regarding claim 14 is that Houser does not teach sending the object identifier to a metadata server and receiving a brand identifier from the metadata server and displaying a representation of the brand identifier. The examiner does not agree because Houser teaches sending the object identifier to a metadata server and receiving a brand identifier from the metadata server and displaying a representation of the brand identifier (fig. 1; element 140; col. 9,lines 55-60; col. 8,.lines 58-65; col. 12, lines 55-67; col. 16, lines 34-50).

2